

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/115,131

Applicant(s)

LAKIN ET AL.

Examiner

Jeremy Norris

Art Unit

2841

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. G. Joseph Buck.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Examiner Norris.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 April 2000.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Temple et al (US 4,905,075).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Buck argued that the alleged "electrically connected" conductors disclosed by Temple did not satisfy the limitations set forth in the present claims because the electrical connection was through an intermediate device and the present invention has a direct connection. Mr. Buck offered to clarify the claim by stating "directly electrically connected". Examiner Norris stated that this would be a new limitation requiring further consideration and if it was presented as part of an After Final Amendment, would not be entered. Mr. Buck contended that the clarification of "directly electrically connected" should not pose any further consideration by the examiner because only direct electrical connections are disclosed in the instant application. Examiner Norris rebutted that since a direct electrical connection was not claimed, an electrical connection through an intermediate device would read on the claim as presented at the time of Final Rejection, and the new limitation of the connection being "directly" connected was not specifically considered, and therefore would require further consideration. Mr. Buck stated that he would submit a formal amendment with the addition of the "directly electrically connected" clarification, for the Examiner's formal consideration.